REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

PERMITS SECTION

| | 5-21- | 80 | | | CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION | ON ATTACHUD. |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| FROM: | G. M. | ARTHU | R | TO: 🗹 | REGION B CITY; | COUNTY; |
| PERMI | T APPLICATION ? | YO C- | | | AR&A COMPLI | ANCE; TEGAL |
| | T ENEMPTION NO | | | | licant indicates copy of applicati | |
| | | • | | | Region City | County |
| 2 1 | EACH INSTITUTE | 10V. 7 17 | ~ ~ / | 001 1015 | DALLAS | |
| 3. I | LATITUDE: <u>3</u> 2 | °- 47 - 23 | LON | GITUDE: 96°- 48'. | 75" COMPANY I.D. NO: | |
| 4. I | PERMIT UNIT NA | ME: MOLD | HEAT | ING FURNACE | ES (3) UNIT I. | D.: |
| | | | | | <u>C-3085</u> → NESHAPS | |
| | | | | EVISION OR CHANGE | - NESHAPS - PORTA | ARTE [] -12D |
| | DATE: | for [| PROPO | SED START OF CONST | RUCTION. 🔲 - CONSTRUCT | |
| | | | | | TING - AS SOON AS | |
| 7. <u>1</u> | NAME AND RATE | OF AIR CONTA Permit Max. | MINANTS: | OPER SCHED: 16 | H/D; <u>5</u> D/W; <u>51</u> W/Y; | CONTINUOUS |
| 2 | Air Contaminant | | M* | Actual Rate | Previous Rate | Comments: |
| | PART. | NIL | <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | wa-versyan, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | | RECEIVED |
| | | | | | | |
| ? | | | | ation for Permit Maximus | | MAY 26 1982 |
| | | | | ata; SP - Similar Permit Do D - Test Data or other: | ata; | region 8 |
| • | () Explai | | | | | TEXAS AIR CONTROL POADO |
| 8. 3 | METHOD OF AIR I PROCESS C | POLLUTION COM | YTROL: [ABATEME | 」- NONE - BACT (NT EQUIPMENT: | Standard) | rred) NEACH FURNACE |
| | • | | | | | |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| 9. 1 | ENGR. COMMENT THERE S | rs/technical r Hould Be | REVIEW/RE | ECOMMENDATION: [TUBLLY NO I |] ISSUE DEXEMPTION EMISSIONS FROM | DENY THIS CPERATION |
| - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 10. | PROPOSED SPECI | AL PROVISIONS | (Other tha | n General Provisions and A | faximum Allowables): | |
| 10. | PROPOSED SPECI | AL PROVISIONS | (Other tha | n General Provisions and 3 | faximum Allowables): | |
| | | | | | | |
| | PROPOSED SPECI | | | | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY |
| | | | | | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE |
| REQUI | | S: (Please return | Your count | | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT SEE SIS DATED _ NO OBJECTIONS. | °S: (Please return | Your count | nents promptly.) | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT | °S: (Please return | Your count | nents promptly.) | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE INSATISFACTORY |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT SEE SIS DATED _ NO OBJECTIONS. | °S: (Please return | Your count | nents promptly.) | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE INSATISFACTORY 9490351 |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT SEE SIS DATED _ NO OBJECTIONS. | °S: (Please return | Your count | nents promptly.) | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE INSATISFACTORY |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT SEE SIS DATED _ NO OBJECTIONS. | °S: (Please return | Your count | nents promptly.) | RUSH SITE O | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY OUESTIONABLE INSATISFACTORY 9490351 |

Other

Findings: Confirmed Unconfirmed Odor Smoke Dust

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES

May 12, 1982

Dallas County Page 2 Consolidated Castings Corp

Investigator's Findings:

An investigation was conducted this date to review the proposed installation of three mold heat treating furnaces at the subject precision steel casting operation. It was found that the three furnaces are already installed. Two are fully operational while the third is nearly so. The City of Dallas APC Section has issued a Notice of Violation of Regulation VI, Rule 116.1.

The process consists of the lost wax method for producing precision castings for machine parts primarily for the petroleum industry. Paraffin base wax items are prepared in one operation and placed onto a "tree" (multiple units, sometimes several hundred to a tree). The "trees" are then coated with a series of soaks in a collodial sand and water mixture. When hardened the items are placed in a steam heated autoclave where the wax melts out and is captured for recycling. A residual wax film is still left in the molds at this—stage. The subject furnaces are used to progressively heat up the sand molds to a ceramic-like state during which the remaining wax is burned out. While the molds are still red hot, molten alloy steel prepared in two electric induction furnaces is ladled into the molds. The remainder of the operation consists of a manual breaking of the molds, deburring, and some machining and heat treating. There are no controls on any of the operations except for 907,000 BTU afterburners on each stack of the subject mold heating furnaces.

As stated, two of the furnaces were operational and no visible emissions were noted from the stacks.

The facility does have a history of visible emission problems associated with the old furnaces. The three subject furnaces replaced three older furnaces which are now being converted to heat treating.

The facility is located within the central business district of Dallas and in this position is surrounded by predominately commercial and warehousing operations.

Recommendation:

Exempt the three replacement mold heat treating furnaces subject to the limitations established in Regulation I, Rule 111.21 (opacity < 20%).



May 28, 1982

James C. Myers, P.E., Acting Director Permits Division Texas Air Control Board 6330 Highway 290 East Austin, Texas 78723

Re: Permit No. X-3611
Consolidated Casting Corporation
Mold Heating Furnaces (3)
(G. McArthur, Engineer)

Dear Mr. Myers:

The City of Dallas has reviewed the referenced application. We concur that these furnaces should be exempted as insignificant sources.

Sincerely,

E. G. Lipnicky

Air Pollution Control Engineer Air Pollution Control Section

dg

cc: Melvin Lewis, Supervisor, Region 8

Rodger Jayroe

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

PERMITS SECTION

| DATE_ | 5-21- | 82 | | | CONFIDENT | HAL INFORMATIC | N ATTACHUD. | |
|-------|--|--|---------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| FROM: | G- M' | ARTHUR | > | TO: | REGION: 8 | 3 OCITY; | COUNTY: | |
| | | | | | ☐ AR&A | | ANCK TEGAL | |
| PERMI | T APPLICATION N | O. C | | • | Applicant indicat | es copy of application | on was sent direct to: | |
| PERMI | TENEMPTION NO | x-3611 | _ | | Region | City | County | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | ACILITY LOCATI | ION: 242 | <u> </u> | AROLINE | , PALLA | <u>S</u> | | |
| | السب السياب (السبي السياب (السبي السبي السبي السبي (السبي السبي السبي السبي (السبي الس | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | - NEW SOURCE | | | | SPS 🗌 - NESIIA | PS 🔲 - PORTA | ABLE PSD | |
| | | | | REVISION OR CHAI | | | | |
| I | DATE: | | | OSED START OF C | | | | |
| | | | | | | | PERMIT IS ISSUED. | |
| 7. | NAME AND RATE | | <u>HNANTS</u> | : OPER SCHED: | 16 H/D; 5 | D/W; 5 (W/Y; | CONTINUOUS | |
| , | Air Contaminant | Permit Max. Allow, Rate | M* | Actual Rate | Pre | evious Rate | Comments: | |
| • | PART. | NIL | | | | | | |
| - | 1 /41012 | 1010 | | .* | | ···· | | |
| - | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | e. | | | | |
| - | | | | ٠. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | | |
| ? | | | | nation for Permit Ma | | Rate - | | |
| | EF - Emission EPA - EPA Da | . Factors; AD - Ap; neuments: FST - F | plication I | Data; SP - Similar Per TD - Test Data or othe | mit Data; | | | |
| | () Explain | | stimate, i | 1) - Yest Baut of Oth | • | | | |
| 8. 3 | - | | TROL: | □-NONE □-B | ACT (Standard) | - BACT (transfer | rred) | _ |
| | METHOD OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL: -NONE -BACT (Standard) -BACT (transferred) -PROCESS CONTROL -ABATEMENT EQUIPMENT: AFTERBURNER ON EACH FURNACE | | | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | | | | |
| - | | - | | | | | | |
| | ENGR. COMMENT. | S/TECHNICAL R | EVIEW/R | ECOMMENDATION | : SSUE | EXEMPTION | DENY | |
| | THERE SI | HOULD BE | VIR | TUNLLY N | O EMISSI | ons from | THIS CPERAT | 1010 |
| 10 . | 22(20/2011) 02501 | AT DESCRIPTIONS | /O.1 | C | | | and the state of t | |
| 10. | ROPOSED SPECI. | AL PROVISIONS | (Other th: | in General Provisions | and Maximum All | owables): | | |
| - | | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | : | | | | | | |
| REQUI | ESTED COMMENT | S: (Please return) | our conv | nents promptly.) | RUSH | | R LOCATION: | |
| | | | | · | • | • | ATISFACTORY | |
| | | | | | | ٠ سب | UESTIONABLE NSATISFACTORY | |
| | SEE SIS DATED | | | | | | N2VII2LVCTOKI | |
| | NO OBJECTIONS. | | , | , | | | | |
| | COMMENTS | No legel | ich | on pending | ·) | | - | |
| - | | 6/25/82 | 7 | , | | | | |
| | | | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

MAY 24 4 11 PM 282 MITS SECTION

| DATE | 5-21- | 87 COM | PLIANCE | NOISIVI | CONFI | DENTIAL IN | SFORMATIC | ON ATTACHUD. |
|----------|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| JITRON | : G. M. | ARTHU | R | то | E REGIO | ON: <u>と</u> | CITY; | COUNTY; |
| per nu | | <i>a</i> | | | ☐ AR&A | ; | (COMPLI | ANCE LEGAL |
| | IT APPLICATION | | | | Applicant is | ndicates copy | of applicati | on was sent direct to: |
| PERM | IT EXEMPTION No | <u> </u> | | | Region | ı | City | County |
| 1. | COMPANY: Co | | | | | | P | |
| 2. | FACILITY LOCAT | | | | | | | |
| 3. 4. | PERMIT UNIT NA | | | | | | | D. : |
| | PREVIOUS RELA | | | | | | 0.811 1. | D.: |
| 6. | - NEW SOURCE | | | | ISPS - N | | - PORTA | ABLE -PSD |
| | - PERMIT AMI | | | | | | | - |
| | DATE: | | | SED START OF C | | | | |
| 7. | NAME AND RATE | | | | | | | PERMIT IS ISSUEDCONTINUOUS |
| •• | | Permit Max, | | · · | | | <u> </u> | CONTINUOUS |
| | Air Contaminant . | Allow, Rate | M* | Actual Rate | | Previous 1 | Rate | Comments: |
| | PART. | NIL | | | | | | |
| | | ļ | | * : | | ····· | | |
| | • | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | EPA - EPA E () Expla | n Factors; AD - A Documents; EST - in | pplication D Estimate; T | ata; SP - Similar Pe D - Test Data or otl | rmit Data; ner: | | | |
| 3, | METHOD OF AIR - PROCESS C | POLLUTION CONTROL | NTROL: [ABATEME | NONE 1 NT EQUIPMENT: | AFT6 | ird) []-B. ERBURN | ACT (transfe | MERCH FURNACE |
| 9. | ENGR. COMMENT | FS/TECHNICAL) | REVIEW/RE | COMMENDATION | N: ISSU | E DI SSIONS | EXEMPTION FROM | DENY THIS CPERATION |
| 10. | PROPOSED SPECI | AL PROVISIONS | Other tha | n General Provision | s and Maximu | ıın Allowable | s): | |
| | | | | | | | . • | The state of the s |
| REQU | ESTED COMMENT | IS: (Please return | your comm | ents promptly.) | RUSH | | ☐ S | R LOCATION: ATISFACTORY DUESTIONABLE |
| | SEE SIS DATED _ NO OBJECTIONS. COMMENTS | | | | | | | NSATISFACTORY |
| | *************************************** | | C.Ru | bich 6-12 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | | 5-2 | 6-82 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CALL

| Time 2:00 PM |
|---|
| Person making call Lary Mathing Tel. |
| Person making call Lary Marthury Tel. Organization TACB Location |
| Person receiving call for Duran Tel. |
| Organization Consolidated Castings Location |
| Subject Consolidated Castings V-3611 |
| summery: I called to clarify some inconsistence |
| in the exemption application. Source # 6 |
| is listed twice on Table 1 - both as an |
| existing source and a new source. Mr. Duras |
| explained that the company has changed their |
| furnace numbering system internally and th |
| Table 1 is in enow. Two of the existing |
| funces shown on the building floor plan |
| as #4 \$ #5 are still used. The new furnaces |
| are #6, #7 \$ #8. These are the only furnaces |
| in use. The 3 new furnaces are used only |
| for heating ceramic molds prior to casting |
| Each furnace has an afterlainer. |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Micopies to: REGION 8